

EMPLOYERS ARE PRESENT

Many Represented in Hearing an Anti-Injunction Bill.

STRONG ARGUMENTS MADE

Bill Denounced as Iniquitous Legislation and an Insult to American Judiciary.

(From Our Regular Correspondent.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 24.—Employers, representing millions of dollars in invested capital in all sections of the country, appeared before the House Judiciary Committee to-day in opposition to the bill which seeks to prohibit the granting of injunctions against strikers. Injunctions, forbidding striking employees going on the property of employers, and in some cases marching, for the purpose of creating enthusiasm and inducing men at work to lay down their tools and join the ranks of the strikers, have been a favorite resort of employers in recent years. The bill, which was framed by labor leaders, seeks legislation to put an end to this method of dealing with strikers by means of injunctions to put an end to this method of dealing with strikers.

Employers have not heretofore appeared in great numbers before congressional committees, but in recent months they have perfected various organizations for their own and appear to be growing more confident. The absence of Samuel Gompers, whose ready wit and sharp tongue make him more than a match for almost anyone pitted against him, somewhat handicapped the labor people present, though the few on hand, after some reluctance, took part in the proceedings.

The principal argument to-day was made by James M. Beck, of New York, formerly assistant Attorney-General, and appearing for the various employers' organizations. He was satisfied, he said, that Legislatures never went into the problem of the relations between capital and labor without doing much mischief than good; the courts were closer to the people, and better able to adjust their judicial constructions to the varying needs of citizenship, and, therefore, such problems should be left to them to solve. Those whom he represented were opposed to the bill, first, because it was ambiguous and will give rise to a flood of writs of which its advocates have but faint conception; second, because its enactment was unnecessary and uncalled for; third, that it would validate unlawful combinations of men banded together to violate the rights of property, and take away from a man the right to sell his labor when he pleases, where he pleases, and to whom he pleases; fourth, that the bill is unconstitutional.

Not Peaceful.

"Peaceful picketing" might exist in theory, but never in practice, and when the employee was compelled to march from his home to his work between lines of pickets, and under the glare of torches and banners, and the threat of violence, sought to intimidate him and thus prevent him from selling his labor, that practice was as unlawful as the right of property, and take away from a man the right to sell his labor when he pleases, where he pleases, and to whom he pleases; fourth, that the bill is unconstitutional.

He mentioned that the complaint of harsh action, in contempt proceedings, and violation of rights, furnish good food for reflection and good ground for remedial legislation. "But," he said, "because some judge may have gone a step beyond the power of the law, and because some deny the right to abolish this ancient writ, which has been conceded to be absolutely essential to the protection of life and property for centuries." A more iniquitous legislation has never been presented to the American Congress.

While the Supreme Court, in his opinion, would undoubtedly declare the bill unconstitutional, employers were opposed to it as "any sort thrown to the labor leaders, who, in their wildest dream, only represent two million men, gives them the hope of no more such increasing demands to prevent by law a man from managing his own business." He insisted the bill was a serious reflection upon the honesty and character of the judiciary, and a source of discontent and dissatisfaction.

"Think long and earnestly," he said, "before you do it. You are not only American citizens, but you are also men, the court of the great American people. Don't cast this undeserved insult upon the courts of the country and don't paralyze their hands in their most important duty to protect the rights of every man to sell his labor precisely as he pleases."

Open Shop.

He was followed by Frederick W. Job, of Chicago, representing the Chicago Central Association and numerous Chicago organizations. Mr. Job said that he advocated four propositions, which he thought every impartial man could endorse: the right of every man to work; the right of every man to output or apprenticeship; and enforcing the laws, according to labor the same rights that he asked for himself.

Edwin Proctor, of St. Louis, secretary of the United Brotherhood of America, of No. 320 Broadway, New York, stated that one-half of the one thousand members of his association conducted non-union shops.

"I plead for the right of every man to pursue his avocation free from undue influence from outside. 'Peaceful picketing' is contradictory in its terms. Can there be a peaceful war? I would just as soon be called a liar as a scab. In view of the fact that there are only two million union laborers to eight million non-union laborers, I consider it rather impudent for these leaders to ask for this legislation, especially as the bulk of their own members don't want it. Being law-abiding citizens."

Frederick Hulso, New York, representing the Building Trades Employers' Association of that city, having one thousand members, spoke of the contest of his organization against Parks and his methods. He maintained that the people against whom the injunctions were issued should go into court and try to have them modified or dissolved; instead of which, they openly violated them. There was no such thing as "peaceful picketing," he said, with a strong accent on "peaceful."

S. Kidgley, of Pittsburgh, protested against the bill in behalf of the National Building Trades Employers' Association, composed of eleven thousand employers, and C. W. Dillon, in behalf of the New River coal operators of West Virginia.

Among others present at the hearing in opposition to the bill were State Senator F. M. Mason, of Indianapolis; James L. Parsons, of Washington, D. C.; John M. Hartwig, of Peoria, Ill.; Antonio C. Pesano, and H. L. Leland, of the Detroit Association, and William Sellers, John M. Glenn, J. P. Argyle, and H. M. Staver, all of Chicago, and Captain C. Smith, of Aurora, representing the Illinois Manufacturers' Association.

SAVE YOUR CHILD.

St. Vitus' Dance Getting Fearfully Prevalent.

Comes From Weak Nerves and Attacks Nervous Children.

Do Not Neglect Your Children's Weak and Irritated Nerves.

There appears to be almost an epidemic of St. Vitus' dance among children. The disease comes directly from weak nerve and an irritated condition of the nerve centers.

Its approach is shown by the nerves becoming weak, the child is pale, nervous, restless, irritable, does not sleep well at night, but tosses restlessly, talks in sleep, grates its teeth, and has irregular appetite. There will be a twitching of the eyelids, the hands, the arms, the legs, or some of the body, which spasmodic movements will gradually increase until the child is more or less helpless.

It is a very serious disease and should never be allowed to run, as the most serious consequences ensue in the utter wreck of the nervous system. It must be cured at once.

The cure of little Edna T., daughter of Mrs. Sarah M. Hunter, is wonderful, and should be known to the parents of every nervous child or sufferer from St. Vitus' dance. Mrs. Hunter says:

"Being your request for information of cures by Dr. Greene's Nervura, I wish to give my experience. My daughter, Edna, had scarlet fever six years ago last spring. She was twelve years old the following July. She had the care of our family doctor and was given every attention. After the danger point was passed I did as the doctor directed, and sent her back to school for two months. As time went on she began to show a nervous trouble. In May I sent her to school again, but she grew so bad I had to take her from school. I took her to my doctor and he said she had St. Vitus' dance. At that time she was in a terrible state, she was so distressed and fed like a baby. When she walked she would drag her right foot; the right side seemed to be afflicted the most. She could hardly talk so as to be understood, and her mind was affected. I thought she would be insane. My doctor treated her for two months, but she grew worse. I read of better. About this time my attention was called to a case of St. Vitus' dance that was cured by Dr. Greene's Nervura blood and nerve remedy. I sent for a bottle and gave it to her. She stopped giving the doctor's medicine, and she was cured. She had taken half a bottle I saw she was improving. I kept right on until she had taken three bottles, then she was seemingly cured. Every one that saw her thought it the most wonderful cure they had ever heard of. But the next year it came back again. Two bottles cured her this time. It came back twice, slightly, afterward, and now for over a year she has shown no signs of a return of it. Her health is very good."

"Both my daughter and myself give our full permission for the publication of this testimonial for the good of others." Watch your children, and if you detect any of the above symptoms, any weakness of the nerves, pale and sallow condition of the skin, loss of appetite, and observe the child growing thin, sharp-featured and puny, give it immediately. The only sure cure for this distressing nervous disease, recognized by physicians, Dr. Greene's Nervura blood and nerve remedy. It will cure the St. Vitus' dance, give the child strong nerves, good digestion, pure blood, and make it grow sturdy and strong.

It is not a patent medicine, but the prescription of the most successful living specialist in curing nervous and chronic diseases, Dr. Greene, of 101 Fifth Ave., New York City. He has the largest practice in the world, and his grand medical discovery is the result of his long experience. The great reputation of Dr. Greene's Nervura is a guarantee that his medicine will cure, and the fact that he can be consulted by any one at any time, free of charge, personally or by letter, gives absolute assurance of the beneficial action of this wonderful medicine.

Some one had said that Senator Kezelle being a member of the General Assembly, could not be compensated for his work if made one of the commissioners, on the ground that he would be holding two offices.

Mr. Bryant raised the same point against the Rockingham member, should he be named along with his colleagues on the board of fisheries, and not as a member of a legislative committee.

Should Not be On.

Mr. Bryant further contended, without meaning to reflect on anyone, that the chairman and secretary of the board were so envied by local conditions that they could not properly deal with the subject, and he said he had reached this conclusion from observation, as a member of the special committee on the subject, and he wanted to learn the oyster conditions. Something had been said about the official controversy between former Delegate S. Wilkins Matthews and Dr. J. W. Bowdoin, chairman of the State Board of Fisheries, and this brought Messrs. Gunter and Shands to their feet, and they warmly defended the board.

Mr. Gunter said both the gentlemen were from his county, and as the senator from Accomac, who knew something of the trouble, he did not believe it had in any way impaired the efficiency of Dr. Bowdoin or any other member. He declared that if this had been the effect there should be an investigation, and if Dr. Bowdoin were not a proper man for the place he should be removed. He believed the Board of Fisheries was the proper body to do the work, and declared that they were faithful and intelligent public servants, who were performing their duties at great sacrifice to their personal interests.

Will Follow It Up.

He announced that he would renew his battle on the floor of the Senate for Mr. Gunter's amendment, which was lost. The vote on the rejection of Mr. Gunter's amendment was 6 to 4, and that of Mr. Kezelle was adopted without division.

The three men whose names will be proposed this evening in the committee are all well known in public life. Mr. Fletcher was long a member of the House from Fauquier county, and was a "horn in the side" of Delegate Matthews, of Accomac, at all times on the oyster question. Judge Watkins is a former member of

the Senate from Prince Edward, and was a member of the joint commission which went over the oyster grounds last summer.

Mr. Tyler is a lawyer of this city, is a half-brother of former Governor Tyler, and is a member of the present Board of Fisheries.

Tidewater People Stirred Up.

The Tidewater contingent were considerably wrought up last night over the latest turn the bill has taken, and some of them expressed the fear that unless the Board of Fisheries shall be delegated to do the work which they contend belongs to this body, there will be many Republicans in the next Legislature from the Tidewater section.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

COMING TO RICHMOND

Commissioner of Lewis and Clark Exposition Will Seek an Appropriation.

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. Glass Doubtful of Passage of Bill Extending It to State Agricultural Commissioners.

(From Our Regular Correspondent.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 24.—The commissioner of the Portland Exposition, which is to be held next year to commemorate the Lewis and Clark expedition, will make an effort at once to secure the co-operation of Virginia in the enterprise. Mr. William B. Matthews, of this city, who is the attorney of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

Mr. Matthews will ask the Legislature to appropriate the sum of \$5,000 for the purpose of defraying the cost of removing to Portland the exhibit of the State of Washington at the national capital, will go to Richmond to-morrow for the purpose of laying before the members of the General Assembly a proposition for an exhibit at the Portland Exposition.

the Senate from Prince Edward, and was a member of the joint commission which went over the oyster grounds last summer.

Mr. Tyler is a lawyer of this city, is a half-brother of former Governor Tyler, and is a member of the present Board of Fisheries.

Tidewater People Stirred Up.

The Tidewater contingent were considerably wrought up last night over the latest turn the bill has taken, and some of them expressed the fear that unless the Board of Fisheries shall be delegated to do the work which they contend belongs to this body, there will be many Republicans in the next Legislature from the Tidewater section.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

the Senate from Prince Edward, and was a member of the joint commission which went over the oyster grounds last summer.

Mr. Tyler is a lawyer of this city, is a half-brother of former Governor Tyler, and is a member of the present Board of Fisheries.

Tidewater People Stirred Up.

The Tidewater contingent were considerably wrought up last night over the latest turn the bill has taken, and some of them expressed the fear that unless the Board of Fisheries shall be delegated to do the work which they contend belongs to this body, there will be many Republicans in the next Legislature from the Tidewater section.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

The fight over the bill in the Senate promises to provoke much bitterness, and the debate will likely be spicy and full of acrimonious thrusts.

They are saying, too, that to delegate others than the Board of Fisheries to do the work is a reflection upon the gentlemen composing that body, and that, moreover, it is doubly so, to take one of them and leave the other four off.

Again, it is contended openly by those who take this latter view that there is politics in the matter, and that the main reason why the work is not delegated to the board is because the members are the appointees of Governor Montague.

"The World of Medicine Recognizes Grip as Epidemic Catarrh."—Medical Talk.

